

JAMES M. HANLEY, N.Y., CHAIRMAN
FRANK J. BRASCO, N.Y.
MORRIS K. UDALL, ARIZ.
CHARLES H. WILSON, CALIF.
RICHARD C. WHITE, TEX.
LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, MD.
WALTER E. POWELL, OHIO
WILLIAM O. MILLS, MD.

EX OFFICIO:
THADDEUS J. DULSKI, N.Y.
H. R. GROSS, IOWA

Executive Registry

71-4930

U.S. House of Representatives
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYEE BENEFITS
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE
207 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
Washington, D.C. 20515

September 23, 1971

Enclosed is the seventeenth report from the Job Evaluation and Pay Review Task Force of the Civil Service Commission established pursuant to Public Law 91-216.

If you have any comments or questions as to the course of action which the Commission has taken, please contact me at the above address, or call me at 225-6295 (Government Code 180).


Richard A. Barton
Staff Assistant

Enclosure

C
O
P
Y
UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20415

September 20, 1971

Honorable Thaddeus J. Dulski
Chairman, Committee on
Post Office and Civil Service
U. S. House of Representatives
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In accordance with Section 304(c) of Public Law 91-216, the following summarizes the activities of the Job Evaluation and Pay Review Task Force for the period ending September 15, 1971.

I. Principal Tasks Worked Upon

- A. The final draft of the Health Services Evaluation System, which is a part of the Special Occupations Evaluation Systems, was distributed for comment. This is confined to occupations in health services directly related to patient care.
- B. The Evaluation System for Teachers in the Federal Government was distributed for comment. There are approximately 23,000 teachers who would be covered under this personal competence ranking system.
- C. The Administrative, Professional, and Technological Evaluation System (APTES) covering some 600,000 employees has been completed and sent out for comment. It is in two volumes, with the second volume containing the majority of the benchmarks which are the heart of the system. This is a factor ranking technique similar to that used in the COMOT system.
- D. The Supervisor and Manager Evaluation System (SAMES) has been completed and will be distributed within the next week. This covers approximately 200,000 supervisors and managers over all workers in all the other systems and covers positions up to the Federal Executive Service.
- E. The Protective Services Evaluation System has been completed and will be distributed within the next ten days. This covers firefighters, policemen, guards, and the related protective services occupations.

The above distributions complete the evaluation systems, or sub-systems, developed by the Task Force. The pay relationships and models of pay schedules to accompany these systems are under development and will be incorporated as part of the final report.

-2-

II. Principal Meetings Conducted or Attended

- A. During the past month meetings were held with the four advisory committees. Each of the four committees was brought up to date on the status of the project and their comments were solicited on the evaluation systems previously submitted for review.
- B. At the request of the AFL-CIO Advisory Committee two additional meetings have been held and more may be scheduled. An effort is being made to assure that there is as much understanding of the Task Force and the AFL-CIO positions as can be achieved.

Sincerely yours,

/s/

Robert E. Hampton
Chairman

Mr. HANLEY. With that, the committee will stand adjourned until the call of the Chair.

(The communication which follows was received by the subcommittee for inclusion in the record.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1971.

Hon. JAMES M. HANLEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Employee Benefits of the Committee on Post Office
and Civil Service, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I should like to take this opportunity, in connection with the hearings on the Interim Progress Report of the Civil Service Commission's Job Evaluation and Pay Review Task Force, to offer comments on those portions of the Report which might apply to positions classified under the Foreign Service Act of 1946 as amended.

Mr. Howard P. Mace, then Deputy Assistant Secretary for Personnel, in his testimony before this Subcommittee on December 3, 1969, urged that provision be made in any position classification legislation for "careful consideration of different philosophies and characteristics of the separate personnel systems so that adequate flexibility is retained for developing methods of evaluation positions fully responsive to each of these personnel systems." I am pleased to note, therefore, that the Interim Report (pages 70-72) recognizes the validity of the rank-in-man concept when combined with a rank-in-job classification scheme and proposes a category for Special Occupations Evaluation Systems (SOES). The Report cites the Foreign Service as one area where an SOES is already in operation. It notes that under a special evaluation system "promotions from one rank to another under the rank-in-man side of the equation would be correlated with the rank in positions at corresponding levels that exist under the rank-in-job side of the equation" and that the principle should be that "promotions in number are directly related to positions in number that exist at any particular skill level." I should like to record, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of State correlates its rank-in-man promotion system with a rank-in-job position evaluation system. On a continuing basis we are cognizant of the number of positions we have at various class levels and the personal rank of our Foreign Service Personnel. Our policy is to relate the number of annual promotions to the number of vacancies in each job specialty at the next higher level. To support this policy simplified standards are being developed for Foreign Service positions. Allocation of those positions to given class levels is on the basis of comparability with other Federal classification systems. The rank-in-man and rank-in-job concepts are used in the assignment of Foreign Service officers to professional, executive and managerial positions and the assignment of Foreign Service Staff personnel to supporting administrative and clerical positions.

In two areas, however, the Interim Report is either unclear or seems to recommend procedures which we would not find compatible with effective personnel management of the Foreign Service. As the Subcommittee is aware, the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, vests in the Secretary of State numerous broad and specific authorities and responsibilities for the appointment, assignment, promotion and separation of personnel and for administration of the Foreign Service personnel system including the provisions of Section 441, which authorizes the Secretary to classify Foreign Service positions, both overseas and in the Department, under such regulations as he may prescribe. Appendix VIII of the Interim Report, under the Section on Special Evaluation Systems, notes that the Task Force has under consideration a rank-in-man/rank-in-job evaluation system for "some or all" of the special categories of personnel of which the Foreign Service is identified as one of the categories. The Report then states that the Civil Service Commission would have a continuing responsibility through its Personnel Management Program to insure that efforts were underway to eliminate any mis-classifications in the rank-in-man/rank-in-job system and that agencies were in fact administering the system as intended. We cannot tell whether these statements are intended to imply that the present authority which the Secretary of State has for administering the Foreign Service personnel system would be changed or modified should the Task Force's recommendations be enacted into law.

While we can subscribe to the Task Force's recommendations for a rank-in-man/rank-in-job evaluation system and for establishing appropriate class levels for each position, we feel that modification of the Secretary's present authority would seriously restrict our flexibility in effective use of Foreign

Service personnel. As a result of our own task force studies made over a year ago, we are currently engaged in implementing a program of management reform in the Department of State which will reshape the Foreign Service so that it can better meet the needs for the 1970's. A number of today's foreign affairs programs did not exist twenty years ago; others have grown considerably in size and importance. Our foreign affairs structure is affected by fast changing conditions overseas. Escalation of tensions, sudden international crises, and new foreign policy approaches by other governments require us to devise new programs or revise the emphasis or direction of existing programs. Such rapid changes in foreign affairs and in staffing requirements to carry out necessary programs demand an administrative flexibility which personnel authority specifically invested in the Secretary of State can best provide. We would thus be opposed to any move which would revoke or modify the Secretary's present authority for personnel administration. Preservation of the Secretary's authority would not, however, work to the detriment of the general objectives as outlined in the Interim Report. Quite the contrary, we feel the Secretary's present authority can be used effectively in accomplishing the general objectives of the Interim Report as well as our own management reforms within the Foreign Service personnel system.

A specific example of our need for flexibility is in the application of the rank-in-man and rank-in-job concepts to Foreign Service supporting staff personnel. It is our understanding that the Job Evaluation and Pay Review Task Force would classify these types of positions on the basis of the rank-in-job scheme proposed for the COMOT evaluation system. We feel strongly that these positions should be classified on the rank-in-man principle as well. For purposes of good management, it is imperative that both officer and supporting staff personnel engaged in foreign affairs activities be subject to assignment wherever needed, both at home and abroad, and that such personnel accept the obligation to serve any place in the world. Our Foreign Service Staff personnel, like our officer personnel, are expected to accept assignment, on an emergency as well as a regular basis, at embassies, at consulates, or at special posts, at metropolitan posts or at isolated posts, at choice posts and at less desirable posts. We aim at planning careers and individual assignments well in advance, i.e., fitting the person to the job, and in most instances the individual is assigned to a position of his own or higher class level. In a world wide service there are, however, recurring cases of having unexpectedly to shift a person to fill a vacancy created through illness, resignation, or death. Work flexibility within a given assignment is also required. Foreign Service secretaries, for example, may have to pinch-hit as communications clerks, do personnel work, or render assistance in everything from emergency evacuation to VIP visits. The rank-in-man concept as applied to staff personnel thus meets many special needs of the Foreign Service. It allows us to plan regular assignments yet gives us the flexibility to satisfy timing requirements and effective use of employee skills. It encourages personal growth and development and helps in maintaining morale in a geographically dispersed organization. It also enables us to avoid undue fluctuations in the class levels of the individual employee. Civil Service clerical personnel assigned in the United States or assigned overseas to work at defense establishments or other static Federal offices are not faced with the same job and assignment requirements as Foreign Service Staff personnel. We would, in fact, find it very difficult to attract, hold and maintain high morale among Foreign Service supporting staff if their individual class levels were subject to change to a lower level depending on assignment requirements.

As is proposed for Foreign Service professional personnel, Foreign Service Staff employees should continue to be considered as a special occupations group for position evaluation purposes and not blanketed in under the proposed COMOT evaluation system.

The position outlined in this letter has been reviewed with the United States Information Agency whose director exercises the same authority on behalf of that Agency. He concurs in the views expressed in this presentation. The Agency for International Development also concurs in this approach.

I wish to thank the Subcommittee for the opportunity to present these views.
Sincerely,

DAVID M. ABSHIRE,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

(Whereupon at 11:45 a.m., the hearing was adjourned to reconvene at the call of the Chair.)

Approved for Release 2002/01/10 : CIA-RDP73B00296R00100150004-1
UNCLASSIFIED CONFIDENTIAL SECRET

OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP

| TO | NAME AND ADDRESS | | DATE | INITIALS |
|-------------|---------------------|--|----------------|------------|
| 1 | Legislative Counsel | | | <i>JR</i> |
| 2 | <i>LL (M)</i> | | | <i>kmf</i> |
| 3 | <i>GLC</i> | | | |
| 4 | | | | |
| 5 | | | | |
| 6 | | | | |
| ACTION | DIRECT REPLY | | PREPARE REPLY | |
| APPROVAL | DISPATCH | | RECOMMENDATION | |
| COMMENT | FILE | | RETURN | |
| CONCURRENCE | INFORMATION | | SIGNATURE | |

Remarks:

For your information.

This is in regard to the Director of Personnel. I have a few questions as to how we are progressing in preparing our own version of the GLC. I will be in touch with you as soon as possible.

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO [REDACTED]

FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO: [REDACTED]

DATE: [REDACTED]

Director of Personnel, 5E56 Headquarters, 24 Sept.
Approved for Release 2002/01/10 : CIA-RDP73B00296R00100150004-1
UNCLASSIFIED CONFIDENTIAL SECRET

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

This is interesting
but merely brings to mind
questions concerning our progress
in preparing ~~must less~~ ^{not be allowed} ~~transmitting~~
our request to CSC - (HBF says
[redacted] his people still keeping a ^{copy}
draft letter around.) - Your note will be ^{not be allowed} ~~transmitted~~ ^{not be allowed} ~~transmitting~~
met at a later date.



25X1A